forward a Bill only for the sake of bringing it forward and not for passing.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: What about this Bill? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I would never agree, I would never concede that the Government would have any such intention in bringing forward any such Bill at any time. What happens is that after a Bill is introduced...*(Interruptions)*..

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, you are speaking on the Bills in general...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Let the Prime Minister be categorical...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am absolutely categorical. ...*(Interruptions)*...Whenever we bring forward a Bill, categorically we want to get it passed. Otherwise, we will not bring it forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Question No. 43. Shri Giri Prasad.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, he has not committed himself on the Lok Pal Bill. ...*(Interruptions)*... He spoke on Bills in general.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have taken enough time. This Bill will be coming up and at that time we can discuss it...*(Interruptions)*...The Prime Minister has given a categorical reply and there should not be any more questions on the subject.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I think we had a very good Zero Hour.

Controversy over Sharing of Cauvery Water

*43. SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD:
SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA:

Will the Minister of WATER RESOURCES be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the recent controversy between the Karnataka and Tamil Nadu State Governments over the sharing of Cauvery water;

(b) if so, the details thereof and the steps taken by Government to settle the controversy and the results achieved with regard thereto;

(c) whether Government are considering a proposal, on priority basis, to take up the question of formulating a national water policy which would provide the basis for resolving the current issue and similar disputes among other States; and

(d) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE AND MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI A. R. ANTULAY): (a) to (d) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) On an application filed by the Government of Tamil Nadu in the Supreme Court for getting directions on the Cauvery Water Disputes Tribunal's order dated 19.12.1995 to the State of Karnataka to release 11 TMC of water, the Supreme Court in its order dated 28.12.1995 requested the Prime Minister to convene a meeting of all concerned to evolve a solution either on consensus or by his own decision to release water immediately to save the standing crops in Mettur Ayacut area of Tamil Nadu.

In pursuance of the above orders of the Supreme Court of India, the Hon'ble Prime Minister held a meeting on 30.12.1995 wherein the Chief Ministers of Karnataka, Kerala, Pondicherry and Tamil Nadu and leaders of various political parties in their respective Legislative Assemblies and some M.Ps. MLAs from these States were present. He held further consultations in separate meetings with all concerned on 31.12.1995 and 1.1.1996. After examining

---

The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri N. Giri Prasad.

the claims of the States, the Prime Minister requested Chief Minister, Karnataka to provisionally release forthwith 6 TMC ft. of water at the rate of 1 TMC ft. water per day in addition to the quantity stipulated in the Cauvery Water Disputes Tribunal interim Order of June, 1991 for saving the standing crops in Tamil Nadu. A three member expert group was constituted by the Ministry of Water Resources on 2.1.1996 as per the directions of the Hon'ble Prime Minister for making a thorough and quick assessment of the ground situation in the State of Tamil Nadu and Karnataka to decide about the further arrangements. The expert group submitted its report on 19.1.1996. The Prime Minister in his letter dated 2nd February, 1996 communicated the main recommendations of the expert group and requested for the comments of the Chief Minister of Karnataka on the same. Copies of this letter were marked to the Chief Ministers of Tamil Nadu, Kerala and Pondicherry.

(c) and (d) Yes, Sir, National Water Board of the National Water Resources Council (NWRC) prepared draft policy guidelines for allocation of waters of inter-State rivers amongst States. The draft guidelines were considered in the 3rd meeting of the NWRC held on 06.02.1996 at New Delhi.

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD: Sir, this is a very sensitive subject. I do not want to go into the controversies that are there between the two States. But the water being an important thing for the agriculture, the peasants are clamouring more and more water. Naturally the State Governments are pressing for their own equitable share. But the problem is that there is no sufficient water in the Cauvery. I think it is a fully exploited river. Unless it is augmented from some other sources, this problem will persist for a long time. Sir, earlier there was a proposal to have a link between the Ganga and the Cauvery and some schemes were also worked out. But, now-a-days, we are not hearing anything about it. I do not want any problem of ecological balance for any other environmental problem that will arise out of this diversion. I do not want any such thing. If everything goes well according to the environmental and ecological consideration, the Government can consider this problem so that the water position is improved in Cauvery and the southern States are benefited. Not only the southern States but also the way from Ganga to Cauvery and the southern fringes in the country will also be benefited. I would like to know whether there is any understanding or thinking or any scheme at the Government level.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI P.V. RANGAYYA NAIDU): Mr. Chairman Sir, the scheme of Ganga-Cauvery was considered and was given up due to technical and financial problems. As an alternative to this, the Government of India has created an organisation called the National Water Development Agency. This Agency has been entrusted with the work of studying the linking of various rivers in this country. So this agency is formulating two schemes or two components of the scheme. One is the Himalayan river and the other is the Peninsular river. The Cauvery comes under the Peninsular river and a draft feasibility report has also been prepared by the NWDA for linking rivers in the Peninsular area. Those schemes are communicated to the State Governments and we are awaiting the reply and response of the State Governments with regard to the connecting of the rivers in the Peninsular area.

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD: Sir, many political parties are involved in these matters, some are regional parties, some are national parties and every political party has to look to the interests of this

... and especially to the aspect of unity and integrity. When such news comes about in the press that such and such States are quarrelling on this issue and such issues are sometimes taken to the Supreme Court. It implies two things, Sir. One is the failure of the political leadership both at the State level and at the national level. The States also are quarrelling among themselves and arousing the sentiments sometimes. Political leadership at the Central Government level, especially the Prime Minister and other concerned Ministers do not participate in these activities to see that such disputes are resolved properly. That is why these matters are being taken to the Supreme Court and nowadays the judiciary is getting an upper hand even over the executive and Parliament. That is why in order to avoid all these things the Central Government, especially the Prime Minister, should convene a meeting of all political parties and set up a body on the basis of the National Integration Council, to consider establishment of water allocation or exploiting the rivers in a more equitable way so that injustice is removed in any part of the country. That is why, in order to protect the interests of the riparian States and also to have an equitable distribution of water, if there is any proposal to have a National Integration Council or Water Allocation Council or whatever we may call it, if any such proposal is there, at least the Government should consider this aspect in formulating such a policy.

SHRI P.V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Government has constituted a body called the National Water Resources Council, India 1987 and it has so far held three meetings and the last meeting was held on the 6th of Februrary, 1996. The Chairman of this Committee is the Prime Minister and the Chief Ministers of all States and Union Territories are members. Sir, the National Water Resources Council has formed a body called the National Water Board which is an official body headed by the Secretary, Water Resources. We have constituted certain guidelines for sharing of waters of Inter-State rivers. Those guidelines have also been discussed in the recent meeting and different Chief Ministers have expressed different opinions. Some have agreed, some have disagreed and some have given suggestions. All these suggestions are now being taken into consideration and then a new draft policy guidelines will be formulated and communicated to the State Government for concurrence. Only after that we can think of formulating some guidelines for distributing Inter-State waters among the riparian States.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र: अध्यक्ष महोदय, वैसे तो सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने कहा था और उसके मुताबिक प्रधान मंत्री ने मीटिंग बुलाई और किया, लेकिन जब ट्रिब्यूनल एक जजमेंट दे चुका था इससे पहले, पता नहीं वह कन्फ्लिक्टिंग होता है या नहीं। हमको नहीं मालूम है कि किस ढंग से यह चल रहा है, तो पहले तो हम यह जानना चाहेंगे कि लीगल पोजीशन क्या है?

दूसरे, हम जानना चाहेंगे इसी सिलसिले में कि चीफ मिनिस्टर्स को जो कापीज़ आफ लैटर भेजी गई है, क्या वह सदन को दी जाएंगी ताकि हम लोग देख सकें कि क्या रिकमेंडेशन है उस एक्सपर्ट कमेटी की? क्या यह सरकार देगी?

वैसे मेरा यह ख्याल है कि हमारे जो नेता लोग थे उन्होंने मिनरल को तो सेंट्रल सब्जेक्ट को दिया लेकिन इंटर स्टेट रिवर को स्टेट में दिया, हमको नहीं समझ में आता कि ज्योग्राफी कैसे कंट्रोल होगी स्टेट की रिवर वगैरह तो बहुत पहले से बना हुआ है, ज्योग्राफी तो बहुत पहले से है और यह पोलिटिकल थिंग तो बाद में है। कभी यह देश बन जाता है, कभी वह देश बन जाता है। इसलिए वह होना तो सेंट्रल में चाहिए था, लेकिन उसका उपाय हमारे हाथ में नहीं है।

तो दो बिन्दुओं पर मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि लीगल आस्पेक्ट क्या है, अभी जो आप काम कर रहे हैं ट्रिब्यूनल के एजेंडा के बाद, उसका? Secondly, whether copies of these letters would be circulated to the Members so that they can understand what is what.

SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: Sir, there is no legal problem in this. The Cauvery Water Dispute Tribunal was constituted under the Inter-State Water Disputes Act, which is a Central Act. The Cauvery Water Dispute Tribunal gave an interim award. On the basis of that interim award, some water had been allocated to Tamil Nadu. A quantity of 205 TMC feet of water was allocated to Tamil Nadu. But Tamil Nadu approached the Supreme Court seeking immediate implementation of this ward because they felt that water was not being released by Karnataka, as per the directions of the Tribunal. Then the hon. Supreme Court gave a direction, to the hon. Prime Minister to convene a meeting of the Chief Ministers of the concerned States as well as other political leaders, MPs and MLAs, and find a solution either by consensus, or, through his own decision. After this meeting, the hon. Prime Minister requested the Karnataka Government to release 6 TMC feet of water.

MR. CHAIRMAN. Shri Muthu Mani.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I did not get the reply to my other question. I wanted the copies of these letters to be circulated to the Members.

SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: Copies of the letters are available.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Sir, normally, copies are not placed on the Table of the House. We can give the gist of the letters. We can give the Members what we have told the Chief Ministers. But placing them on the Table of the House is a technicality; whether a letter could be placed on the Table of the House. That is a matter which we can decide. You can decide, Sir.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: You give us the copies. That is all.

SHRI S. MUTHU MANI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, my question is very simple and straight. Would the Central Government direct the Karnataka Government to release the balance 5 TMC feet of water to Tamil Nadu, as per the directions of the Supreme Court and whether the Central Government is thinking of taking some Constitutional action, when an upper riparian State is refusing to release the due share of water to the lower riparian State?

SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: Sir, the water released between 1.6.95 — the beginning of the Water year — and 27.2.96, *i.e.* till day-before-yesterday, is quite sufficient.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sufficient? Who said it is sufficient? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: I am giving you the figures. *(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: We know it is not sufficient. We know it is not sufficient for Tamil Nadu. We raised the matter yesterday. Who says it is sufficient? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: I will tell you why I say it is sufficient. *(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: How can it be sufficient? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: Would you allow me to complete my answer? *(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: We went to the Supreme Court seeking the implementation of the award. He is saying it is sufficient: *(Interruptions)*

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Are you going to direct the Karnataka Government to release the water or not? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: Let me complete the answer. When I say it is sufficient, I mean that as per the award given by the Cauvery Water Dispute Tribunal....*(Interruptions)* I am giving you the figures. The Tribunal's award was 205 TMC feet of water. Up to.....

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: That was three years ago.

SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: Up to 17.2.96, as per that award, Tamil Nadu was to get 198.12 TMC feet of water. against that, Tamil Nadu has received 200.8 TMC so far. These are the figures given by the CWC.....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI S. MUTHU MANI: No, Sir. ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI PASUMPON THA. KIRUTTINAN: He cannot say like that. ....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Do you want to change the figures? .....*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will call you. ....*(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: He has not been correctly informed.....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: I am not supporting any State.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, even the Karnataka Chief Minister says that he has released only 6 TMC, but this Minister is saying that they have released 198 TMC...*(Interruptions)*

Sir, today he is more loyal than Mr. Deve Gowda.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Sir, the Prime Minister appointed a committee. ...*(Interruptions)*

Sir, only one word. The Prime Minister appointed an experts' committee. ....*(Interruptions)*

Sir, please allow me to speak....*(Interruptions)*

Wait a minute, please.

After the release of 6 TMC of water, the Prime Minister said that he would appoint a committee and that he would consider giving 5 TMC of water later. The committee has already given its opinion. On the basis of that, the Prime Minister wrote to the Karnataka Chief Minister to give 2 TMC of water. The Karnataka Government has not obliged. It has not given 2 TMC of water as per the direction of the Prime Minister. What action are you going to take? This is one thing.

Secondly, the experts' committee report has not been revealed. It has not been made transparent. It has not been sent to the States. We want to know what the experts' committee report is, what they have suggested to you. Do they say that Tamil Nadu deserves 5 TMC or water or do they say that Tamil Nadu does not deserve it?

I want to have clear answers on these two points....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: The Government of India have equal regard and respect for the wishes of the people of Tamil Nadu as well as the people of Karnataka. We will not take the side of anybody. We have to speak on the basis of figures available with us, which have been supplied by the Observation Stations of the Central Water Commission located in the Cauvery basin.

Sir, the report of the committee is confidential. However, the main recommendations of the committee have been communicated to all the Chief Ministers, the Chief Ministers of Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Kerala and Pondicherry also. Do you want me to read them out?

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: The committee report?

SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: Not the report. but the main recommendations of the committee have been com-

municated to the Cheif Ministers.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: What about the 2 TMC of water that the Prime Minister had recommended to the Karnataka Government? They have not obliged on that.

SHRI P.V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: That is what I am saying.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Is it a fact that the Prime Minister recommended to Karnataka to release 2 TMC of water to Tamil Nadu?

SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: No, there is no such recommendation. We have communicated the recommendations of the experts' committee to the Cheif Minister of Karnataka for his remarks and action.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: What does it say about 2 TMC of water? They have not given it. The experts' committee recommended to Karantaka to release 2 TMC of water. They have not relases it. What action have you taken on this?

SHRI P. V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: Sir, the experts' committee recommended release of 2.5 TMC of water in the months of January, February and March in addition to normal releases, to be set off against releases in April and May. That has been complied with.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the whole truth has come out before the House. The Tribunal award was only.....(*Interruptions*)

Just a minute.

The whole calim is based on the Tribunal award. The Tribunal award is for only 205 TMC.

But Tamil Nadu has drawn 208 TMC according to the statistics....(*Interruptions*)...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI PASUMPON THA. KIRUTTINAN: He is misleading the House.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: It is wrong, Sir. ....(*Interruptions*)... Surplus water was used for irrigation in Tamil Nadu.

....(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI PASUMPON THA. KIRUTTINAN: The Member has got a right to speak, but he cannot mislead the House-...(*Interruptions*)....

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Why don't they go before the Tribunal and say all these things?.....(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Sir, I need your protection.

.....(*Interruptions*)....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please allow the Member to ask his question. Let's not reduce this to Zero Hour. We had enough in the Zero Hour yesterday-.....(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI MISA R. GANESAN: Mr. Hanumanthappa is giving a wrong figure.

SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN: It is the Minister who says this....(*Interruptions*).....

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: It is not only a*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wont's allow that word to go on record.

.....(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: He is misleading the House.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Please allow me to conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hanumanthappa will complete his question, please....(*Interruptions*)....

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: It is wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Sir, I am only on one issue. The Surpreme

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

Court, based on the petition of Tamil Nadu, has observed that it is not proper and these things cannot be dragged before tribunals and courts. These are sensitive matters connected with the States-inter-State problems. So these things have to be settled at a different level, at the political level, at the intervention of the Central Government.

SHRI MISA R. GANESAN: Then why did you go to the Tribunal?

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: I am sorry.....(*Interruptions*)....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't put questions to the Member, please.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Sir, I don't want to answer their queries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please don't.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Karnataka never accepted the Tribunal, never wanted the Tribunal. Kernataka, from the very beginning, wanted a solution at the political level. ....(*Interruptions*).... Even today we don't want the Tribunal.

SHRI PASUMPON THA. KIRUTTINAN: Karnataka did not want the Tribunal but Tamil Nadu wanted the Tribunal....(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: My last question is....(*Interruptions*)...My only question is....(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member has a right to ask a question.

.....(*Interruptions*).....

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: My only question is.....(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI MISA R. GENESAN: The Prime Minister wanted 11 TMC to be released.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you please sit down?.....(*Interruptions*)....Please conclude, Mr. Hanumanthappa.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Sir, truth is bitter. The Tribunal had awarded 11 TMC but they have drawn 14 TMC already. ...(*Interruptions*)... My question is...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI T.A. MOHAMMED SAQHY: How can he give this figure?

....(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Five plus six plus three makes it 14.

....(*Interruptions*)....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please. I will go to the next question if this is reduced to Zero Hour.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: My submission is, without depending only upon the Tribunal's and the Court's verdict, I request the hon. Prime Minister to take up this issue—as he has already taken it up--call the concerned parties and come to a negotiated settlement. That is all the assurance that I want from the Government. After all, facts are totally different. If the Court has ordered only 11 TMC, during the same period — my friends know it very well — five plus six plus three, that is, 14 TMC, has already been drawn...(*Interruptions*)...Mere shouting will not bring them water...(*Interruptions*)....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Has the Minister any response to it?

SHRI MISA R. GANESAN: The whole country knows. You cannot simply go on shouting....(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI K. RAHAMAN KHAN: By shouting, you cannot get water. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI P.V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: Sir, we always welcome.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Muthu Mani, Please sit down.

SHRI P.V. RANGAYYA NAIDU: We always welcome a negotiated settlement. But, Sir, you yourself have seen what is happening here in this House. It is not possible to bring about any settlement by negotiation. That is why they have to go to the Court. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 44. (*Interruptions*). I am sorry. I cannot proceed with this question. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, Our Minister who is from Andhra Pradesh is unnecessarily sandwiched between Tamil Nadu and Karnataka. (*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: We were never given a chance to refute all the wrong statements. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 44.

Prime Minister's Integrated Urban Poverty Eradication Programme

*44. SHRI RAHASBIHARI BARIK: Will the Minister of URBAN AFFAIRS & EMPLOYMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the date of the announcement of the Prime Minister's Integrated Urban Poverty Eradication Programme (PMI UPEP);

(b) the schemes implemented in different States under the above programme so far;

(c) the urban areas identified in Orissa and other States for implementing that programme; and

(d) the details of the fund allocation made for the purpose?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND EMPLOYMENT (DEPARTMENT OF URBAN EMPLOYMENT AND POVERITY ALLEVIATION-(SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA): (a) to (b) a statement is laid ontheTable of the Sabha. (a) and (b) The Prime Minister's Integrated Urban Poverty Eradication Progamme (PMI UPEP) was lunched on 18th November, 1995 with emphais on self-employment generation, skill developmentTraining and shelter upgradation.

(c) The list of 345 Class II Urban Agglomerations including those of Orissa, and 74 district towns of north-easternHill States identified for coverage under the Programme is at Annexure. [*See* Appendix 176, Annexure No. 12]

(d) The details of the funds allotted for the Programme are given in Annexure (*See* Aappendix 176, Annexure No. 13]

SHRI RAHASBIHARI BARIK: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to know the basis on which they have chosen the towns for inclusion. They have included in their list only 10 towns of Orissa. Why have the others been left out? Have they issued and specific guidelines choosing such towns? And, is the Government aware of the fact that the financial institutions are not cooperating in this programme? As it is shown on the TV, it is very colourful; but in reality, we do not find it to be so.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have selected these Class II towns on the basis of the Census of 1991. "Class II towns" means towns where the population is between 50,000 and one lakh. In Orissa, there are only 10 Class II towns mentioned by the Census of India, 1991.

As for the banks, the Reserve Bank of India has issued guidelines, detailed guidelines, to accept the application and sanition loan within 15 days' time after the full application is received by the respective banks.

SHRI RAHASBIHARI BARIK: What is the amount released to the Government of Orissa so far?

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: As a Central subsidy, we have given about Rs. 2.69 crores to Orissa recently.

श्री जनार्दन यादव: बिहार के बारे में बोलिये।

श्री ए० एस० अहलुवालिया: आप पूछिए।

श्री जनार्दन यादव: सभापति महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूं कि बिहार में कितने शहरों में कितने व्यक्तियों को गरीबी उन्मूलन के लिये आपने अभी तक पैसा मुहैया कराया है प्रधान मंत्री योजना के तहत?